

MINUTES

CITY PLAN COMMISSION/ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

MARCH 3, 2008

The City Plan Commission/Architectural Review Board of the City of Clayton, Missouri, met upon the above date at 5:30 p.m., Chairman Harold Sanger presiding. Upon roll call, the following responded:

Present

Harold Sanger, Chairman
Steve Lichtenfeld, Aldermanic Representative
Lenore Toser-Aldaz, Deputy City Manager
Marc Lopata
Jim Liberman
Scott Wilson

Absent:

Debbie Igielnik

Also Present:

Catherine Powers, Director of Planning & Development Services
Jason Jaggi, Planner
Kevin O'Keefe, City Attorney

Chairman Sanger welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked that conversations not take place during the meeting and that all cell phone and pager ringers be turned off.

MINUTES

The minutes of the regular meeting of February 4th, 2008 were presented for approval. The minutes were approved, after having been previously distributed to each member.

Catherine Powers indicated that due to the lengthy discussion that will take place regarding the RJ York Project, the continuation of the architectural review for the second unit at 7544 Maryland Avenue will be considered first.

2ND STORY ADDITION TO DETACHED GARAGE (FOR USE AS A SECOND UNIT) – 7544 MARYLAND AVENUE

Ms. Diane Lochner, project architect, was in attendance at the meeting.

Catherine Powers explained that the new proposal shows wood panels and trim on the upper quarter of each elevation which matches the rear of the existing residence. In addition, a pre-cast

stone sill has been added between the brick and siding to further tie the two structures together. The applicant has submitted calculations which show that the siding does not exceed 25% on each elevation, in conformance with the Architectural Review Guidelines. The applicant is proposing to remove the roof of the garage and lower the ceiling height of the garage to accommodate the second level. On the north elevation, a new door and exterior stairway are proposed to provide access to the second unit. On the west elevation, four small windows will be placed on the second story. The east elevation will contain three larger windows centered above the existing garage doors. The low-pitch roof will be shingled to match the primary house. The plans show the HVAC unit will be located behind the second unit facing the alley and screened with a vinyl fence. The height of the structure as shown on the plans is approximately 19-feet 11-inches, which is at the maximum allowed of 20-feet for second units. Catherine indicated that staff believes the new proposal is a more attractive design because it utilizes elements of the primary residence. The lighter colored siding should help to reduce the appearance of massing and height connected with this structure. Staff prefers the screening of the HVAC unit to be wood instead of vinyl for a more quality appearance and the applicant has agreed to make the change and therefore, recommends approval with the condition that the HVAC unit screening be wood instead of vinyl.

Ms. Lochner stated that they re-visited the design based on the comments received at the previous meeting.

A color rendering depicting the elevations was presented.

Jim Liberman commented that it looks great. He asked about the siding material.

Ms. Lochner indicated that it will be Hardie Board.

Being no further questions or comments, Marc Lopata made a motion to approve as submitted. The motion was seconded by Scott Wilson and unanimously approved by the Board.

PUBLIC HEARING/REZONING FROM R-3 "ONE & TWO FAMILY DWELLING DISTRICT" TO C-2 "GENERAL COMMERCIAL DISTRICT"

Tyler Stephens, project architect, was in attendance at the meeting.

Catherine Powers explained that 111 North Central Avenue is owned by RJ York SSG, LLC and 119 North Central Avenue is owned by the St. Louis County Catholic Church Real Estate Corporation. Catherine noted that the City owned parking lot at 103 North Central is already zoned C-2. The proposed rezoning will allow the above referenced lots to be included in a commercial Planned Unit Development (PUD) encompassing the northwest and southwest corners of Maryland and Central Avenues. The rezoned lots, along with 103 North Central Avenue, will contain a 3-level, 420 space parking garage with an entry off of Central Avenue. Displaced parking for the church as well as the City's public spaces will be included in the proposed new garage. In addition to the 420 space parking facility, the 3-story, 40 foot in height structure will contain approximately 18,500 square feet of retail/restaurant space and approximately 9,200 square feet of office space facing Maryland Avenue. Catherine Powers indicated that rezoning properties from residential to commercial is very unusual in Clayton; however, in this situation, the use of these lots has been primarily parking for the Central Business District and that use, while intensified, will continue even though the lots are rezoned. If approved

by the Board of Aldermen, these two properties will be a part of a larger Planned Unit Development project. Because this rezoning is in support of a larger project, staff recommends placing a condition which ties this rezoning request to construction of the entire Planned Unit Development Project and therefore, recommends approval of the rezoning with the condition that the rezoning be contingent upon approval of the Planned Unit Development by the Board of Aldermen. If approval of the Planned Unit Development expires, becomes invalid or the project is not constructed, the subject properties will revert back to R-3 "One and Two Family Dwelling District".

Chairman Sanger asked staff for an overview of the items for consideration this evening.

Catherine Powers explained that this evening's agenda includes public hearings and recommendations to the Board of Aldermen for rezoning approvals and preliminary development plan as well as conceptual review for the site plan and architectural aspects of Phase 1 of the project. She stated that approvals that are being sought this evening include a recommendation for rezoning the properties at 111 & 119 N. Central from R-3 to C-2 (as explained above), rezoning all subject properties (103, 111, 119 & 25 N. Central) to a Planned Unit Development District and approval of the Preliminary Development Plan for the entire project. In addition, conceptual consideration is being asked for the site plan and architectural aspects of Phase 1 only. She indicated that the Final Development Plan will be considered at a later date. She reiterated that the rezoning requests and Preliminary Development Plan are public hearings and have been advertised as such. She informed the members that plans for the entire project are not yet complete. She stated that staff is asking for a vote on the rezoning requests and a possible vote on the Preliminary Development Plan.

Chairman Sanger asked if the project does not get approved or if it does not get constructed, if the rezoned properties revert back to their original zoning classification.

Catherine Powers replied "yes".

Jim Liberman asked if it is acceptable to go from R-3 to C-2 and then to a Planned Unit Development (PUD) District.

Catherine Powers replied "yes"; she stated it has been done in the past.

Steve Lichtenfeld made a motion to open the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Jim Liberman and unanimously approved by the members.

Mr. Stephens, representing RJ York, developer, indicated that they have been working on this project for about a year and that in order to understand the zoning issues, he believes it would be helpful to view the project as a whole.

Catherine Powers reminded everyone that this portion of the review is only for the rezoning of the two properties from R-3 to C-2 and is a public hearing.

Chairman Sanger commented that it would be beneficial in deciding if rezoning is appropriate if the project is understood.

Mr. Stephens began a PowerPoint presentation. The first slide depicted the view from the proposed hotel. He stated the Forsyth Boulevard is the retail spine through the Central Business District (CBD) and that this project is in the center of this retail core.

A slide depicting a rendering of the hotel and one depicting an overhead view of the subject lots was presented. Mr. Stephens indicated that the parcels include three parking lots as follows: City owned lot containing 43 spaces; RJ York owned lot containing 60 spaces and church lot containing 28 spaces. He stated the purpose of the rezoning is to allow the construction of a garage, which will be a 3-way partnership between the developer, church and city.

A slide depicting buildings in the immediate area was presented. Mr. Stephens stated that Central Avenue, towards the north, slopes up and that, as such, the condominium building to the north (139 N. Central) is built up. A slide depicting the condominium building's patio space with a privacy fence was shown.

A slide depicting an aerial view of the properties was shown.

Mr. Stephens began discussing the setback at the third level. He stated all retail faces Maryland and that the entrance to the garage is off Central Avenue; somewhat close to the intersection. He pointed out the area of the green rooftop garden area. He stated that currently, there is a lot of foot traffic crossing Maryland Avenue and that the corners have been pushed back to tie them together.

A slide depicting the garage was presented. He stated that there will be 85 parking spaces within the south building to serve the residential (condominium) units and that the 420 space garage will also include approximately 18,000 square feet of retail (on two stories) and approximately 9,000 square feet of office space on the 3rd level. A rendering (slide) depicting hotel was presented. He stated the hotel will provide a valet parking drop off area. He indicated that it is hoped that good tenants (i.e. Il Vicino and San Sai) will remain as well as possibly a bookstore.

A slide depicting both proposed buildings and Maryland Walk for height comparison was presented.

Mr. Stephens provided a brief explanation of the proposed parking spaces in the garage. He stated that after everything is "parked" (including retail), there will be 86 available public spaces.

A slide depicting the corner of the garage, which is notched back and notched down, including the landscaping, was presented.

Slides depicting shadows throughout various times of the year were presented. Mr. Stephens explained that the "skinniness" of the hotel helps with the shadow impact and that the garage does not have much of an impact on the current shadow. He noted that the condominium's privacy fence is still in light.

Steve Lichtenfeld asked the difference between this garage proposal and the original garage proposal.

Mr. Stephens indicated that they started out with a 5 level garage; 2 below grade and 3 above grade, but after the parking study was completed, they added one more level below grade).

Steve Lichtenfeld asked why the church could be seen before whereas now, it is obliterated.

Mr. Stephens stated that the church is not as high as they originally thought it was.

Steve Lichtenfeld commented that the garage seems more vertically massive now.

Jim Liberman asked if classroom space for the church is no longer included in the proposal.

Mr. Stephens replied “yes”. He stated that the church has decided that classroom space is not needed.

Jim Liberman asked if 9,000 square feet of office space is needed.

Mr. Stephens replied “yes”.

Jim Liberman asked who owns the excess parking spaces.

Mr. Stephens stated they will be City owned public spaces.

Catherine Powers indicated that due to the City’s contribution for this project, the City wants to see the current spaces made-up plus additional spaces for Central Avenue retail.

Chairman Sanger commented that the parking issue will be discussed in more detail later. He asked for public input.

Matt Geekie, Deputy General Counsel of Graybar Electric, introduced himself to the members. He advised the members that he heard of this project’s resuscitation just last Thursday. He indicated that Graybar Electric moved here 25 years ago and that they enjoy being here. He stated he believes the project has a negative impact on their building and that currently, his office looks out onto three parking lots and that it seems to him that there is plenty of parking. He then asked about a traffic study.

Catherine Powers indicated that the traffic study has not yet been distributed as the project itself is only in conceptual stages right now.

Mr. Geekie commented that if the rezoning is not approved, then the project cannot be approved. He asked that the project be denied. He stated he is aware that there will be more opportunity in the future to speak with regard to this project. He asked about a pedestrian traffic study.

Catherine Powers advised Mr. Geekie that there is no pedestrian traffic study.

Mr. Geekie asked in terms of the City's donation of its lot, if the City will get money back. He asked that someone needs to look at where the money is coming from and where it is going to.

Catherine Powers advised Mr. Geekie at this Commission is not involved with that aspect of the project. She stated that issue is taken up by the Board of Aldermen.

Mr. Geekie stated that a building of that size warrants an earthquake study.

Jim Kerley, 139 N. Central condominium owner, advised the members that he saw the drawings about 6 weeks ago and that since that time, the building seems to have grown. He stated he has concerns with the traffic study and that two of the existing parking lots do not serve the CBD. He stated he would like to know the financial viability of the project.

Chairman Sanger indicated that it is the job of this Commission to review the zoning, use and visual aspects of the project and that the Board of Aldermen considers financial implications.

Rick Meyer, 139 N. Central condominium owner, stated he is not aware of previous meetings with the condo owners and that previously, the top floor of the garage was to be used for classrooms and that now, they are proposing office space. He stated that he is unaware of any negotiations with the condo owners.

Mr. Stephens commented that they previously met with Aldermen Lichtenfeld and Berger before meeting with the residents. He stated the change in use from classrooms to office was a result of the City asking for more parking and that office would bring in more revenue for the City.

Msgr. John Shamleffer, St. Joseph's Church, indicated that he has met with the applicant and that he has a concern regarding shadows cast on the church's stain glass windows. He stated that the church prefers not to have offices on the top floor of the garage and that the church wants what is best for the City and for the church. He stated that the church would like to support the project.

Chairman Sanger commented that the City is not asking for this project; it is a private agreement with the developer.

Mel Disney, Clayton resident, commented that the church lot is used as access to the rear of the facility and that there are no curb cuts on the west side of the church property. He stated that there will be foot traffic to the hotel from the garage.

Mr. Stephens agreed that there will be foot traffic.

Msgr. Shamleffer commented that there are two driveways off Meramec Avenue.

There were no more public comments. Steve Lichtenfeld made a motion to close the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Jim Liberman and unanimously approved by the members.

Chairman Sanger reiterated that this rezoning is specifically tied to this project.

Catherine Powers concurred.

Jim Liberman asked if once the properties are rezoned to C-2 and then to a PUD, if this rezoning is contingent on approval of the entire project. He asked what commits the second phase.

Kevin O'Keefe stated that the rezoning of the properties at 111 & 119 North Central from R-3 to C-2 is contingent on the approval of the PUD and that the PUD is contingent upon the entire project; the wording of which will be in the PUD Ordinance.

Chairman Sanger asked for clarification of what happens if the garage is constructed, but not the hotel.

Kevin O'Keefe commented that the City will eventually own the garage.

Steve Lichtenfeld asked if the rezoning is approved, if other aspects of the project (i.e. mass, height, etc.) are still negotiable.

Kevin O'Keefe replied "yes". He reiterated that the PUD Ordinance will stipulate issues such as those.

Being no further questions or comments, Jim Liberman made a motion to recommend approval of the rezoning of the properties from R-3 to C-2 to the Board of Aldermen per staff recommendation. The motion was seconded by Scott Wilson and unanimously approved by the Board.

PUBLIC HEARING/REZONING & PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN – 25, 103, 111 & 119 NORTH CENTRAL AVE.

Catherine Powers explained that this project will be a hotel/residential/retail mixed-use project to be constructed in two phases as follows:

PHASE 1:

Phase 1 will be constructed first and will consist of a 6-level garage structure with three levels below grade and three levels above grade. The garage will contain 420 parking spaces; 93 spaces for public parking and 327 spaces for the hotel and retail parking use. Replacement of church parking will be shared with the hotel parking. The garage will be accessed from Central Avenue. This Phase will also include 18,420 square feet of ground floor retail/restaurant space and 9,177 square feet of office use. The retail and office portion will face Maryland Avenue.

PHASE 2:

Plans for Phase 2 are not as clearly defined, but generally consists of a 22 story hotel/condominium tower on the southwest corner of Central and Maryland Avenues. The hotel will provide 220 rooms, 9,700 square feet of meeting space, a 5,000 square feet restaurant and 14,180 square feet of accessory uses. This Phase also includes 40 condominium units. Eighty-five (85) parking spaces for the condominium units are located beneath the building.

Catherine indicated that the project is in compliance with the Business Districts Master Plan for Action Area #2 and that the Zoning Ordinance stipulates that PUDs are a distinct zoning district intended to provide a means for the redevelopment of an area in a unified land development that will improve the quality of the subject properties and have a beneficial effect on adjacent residential areas. Catherine stated that the project meets the criteria for PUD pursuant to Chapter 22, Article 22, Section 22.9 and that although Phase 1 does not exceed height or Floor Area Ratio (FAR), it is being considered as part of a total project which does exceed FAR and height. Phase 2 of the project meets the criteria of Chapter 22A, Article 3a.5 and that since PUDs are distinct zoning districts, a vote to rezone from C-2 for Phase 1 and from CBD Core Overlay for Phase 2 is necessary for approval of this project.

Catherine continued by stating that while there is no specific category for Preliminary Development Plans, the Zoning Ordinance refers to the Development Plan and lists several components to be considered. Some of the criteria for consideration contain language regarding a "Preliminary" Development Plan. This is a complex project which requires multiple levels of approval and has two phases; each on a different time-line. While plans for Phase 1 are in complete form and ready for review, the plans for Phase 2 are not complete. Therefore, a final review of the proposed Planned Unit Development is premature at this time. However, there is benefit to both the City and the developer in conducting a "preliminary" review which will be the basis for the Final Planned Unit Development. The preliminary approval will consider the basic elements of the project including use, square footage and public benefit. This project seeks relief from Floor Area Ratio (FAR) and height. The base zoning maximum FAR for both the CBD Overlay and C-2 phases of the project is 1.5. The entire project, as proposed, has a FAR of 4.89. The CBD Core Overlay District, which encompasses the hotel phase of the project, has a maximum height restriction of 4 stories. This height restriction may be waived through the Planned Unit Development Process; however, if height is waived, there must be 15 foot step-back at the third story or other step-back as approved by the Plan Commission. This project will require a PUD modification to build a 22-story structure; 18 stories higher than allowed by the underlying zoning. Phase 2 of the project will also need a waiver from the rear yard setback requirement.

At this time, Catherine provide a review of the public benefits to the City to be derived from the approval of the development plan and the public benefits specific to the CBD that are intended to be derived from the approval of the planned unit development. Catherine stated that staff recommends approval of the rezoning and the Preliminary Development Plan components of the project with the following conditions:

1. That a plat showing all boundary adjustments and revisions to public infrastructure be approved by the Plan Commission and Board of Aldermen when the timing is appropriate.
2. That architectural review of the building design and materials, landscape plan, garage design, hotel/condominium design and materials be submitted to and approved by the Architectural Review Board.
3. That site plan review, including streetscape and storm water mitigation, be approved in concert with the Architectural Review Board approval.
4. That the project be LEED Certified and proof of project registration be submitted prior to issuance of building permits and that certification be complete prior to final certificate of occupancy.
5. That the Final Development Plan be submitted to and approved by the City's Plan Commission and Board of Aldermen and filed with St. Louis County.

Catherine noted the statement made earlier that there would be 86 public parking spaces when, in fact, staff believed there to be 93. She stated that staff is only requesting approval, at this time, of the Preliminary Development Plan since the hotel plans are not yet completed.

Chairman Sanger voiced his confusion about the need to rezone two of the subject properties from R-3 to C-2.

Catherine Powers explained that only commercially zoned districts are eligible for PUDs.

Note that Scott Wilson left the meeting (6:50 p.m.).

Catherine Powers asked that the two items (rezoning and Preliminary Development Plan) be voted on separately.

Steve Lichtenfeld made a motion to open the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Marc Lopata and unanimously approved by the members.

Jim Liberman stated that he is a bit confused. He asked what the substantive results are from tonight's votes.

Catherine Powers explained that the votes this evening are to rezone the C-2 and CBD Overlay zoned properties to a PUD and to approve the Preliminary Development Plan. She stated the Final Development Plan would come back at a later date.

Kevin O'Keefe commented that ordinarily, greater detail is provided for a PUD project, but that is not the case with this project. He reiterated that a PUD can only occur from a commercial district and that is why the R-3 properties need to be rezoned to a C-2 district and

that the question is if all the pieces tie together. He advised the members that until the Final Development Plan is approved, the rezoning is not complete.

Marc Lopata asked Mr. Stephens if he is comfortable with staff's recommendations, specifically with regard to LEED Certification.

Mr. Stephens replied "yes".

Mr. Geekie asked if there are any other parcels with the buildings as close together as this building and Graybar's building.

Mr. Meyer asked if Phase 1 can be built without Phase 2.

Chairman Sanger stated that he believes both phases must be approved before building permits can be issued.

Kevin O'Keefe stated that the City's intent is that both phases be constructed or neither phase be constructed; however, they are not to be constructed simultaneously and due to circumstances beyond one's control (i.e. bankruptcy, famine, etc.) it is possible; however not intended or realistic, that one could be built without the other.

Marc Lopata commented that with regard to the close proximity between the garage and Graybar's building, the close distance is only up to the third floor.

Mr. Stephens concurred. He added that certain separation is needed in order to comply with the Fire Code.

Marc Lopata asked if the lower portion of Graybar's building is parking.

Mr. Stephens replied "yes" and that is a reason they are phasing the project so as not to disrupt business parking. He reiterated that they would like to keep the retail tenants if possible.

Being no further comments from the audience, Jim Liberman made a motion to close the public hearing. The motion was seconded by Marc Lopata and unanimously approved by the members.

Catherine Powers reminded the members that the votes need to be separate.

Marc Lopata asked the applicant if the core and shell of the project will be LEED certified.

Mr. Stephens replied "yes".

Jim Liberman made a motion to recommend rezoning the subject properties to the Board of Aldermen to a Planned Unit Development District and that if the project does not go forward, that the zoning revert back to the original zoning classification. The motion was seconded by Steve Lichtenfeld and unanimously approved by the members.

Catherine Powers asked that the members now consider the Preliminary Development Plan.

Kevin O’Keefe indicated that the Preliminary Development Plan sets the framework for the Final Development Plan and that the final plan has to be in conformity with the preliminary plan.

Chairman Sanger stated that in that regard, he is uncomfortable pursuing approval at this time.

Steve Lichtenfeld agreed.

Jim Liberman stated that he would like more clarification regarding the parking. He stated that from an architectural standpoint, the building seems massively scaled, lacks quality and is not yet fine tuned compared to that of the Retail Village. He stated the cannot architecturally understand the hotel portion, but that it is massive and not well detailed.

Catherine Powers reminded the members that the site plan and architectural issues are on the agenda for conceptual review this evening.

Chairman Sanger commented that they have already voted to recommend approval that this area is suitable for a PUD Project.

Steve Lichtenfeld reiterated his concern with voting for the Preliminary Development Plan this evening and that the residents concerns need to be addressed.

Catherine Powers stated that it seems that some motion is needed regarding the Preliminary Development Plan.

Kevin O’Keefe agreed.

Catherine Powers reminded that the conceptual review this evening is for Phase 1 only and suggested that the developer be given the chance to make a presentation and receive input.

Catherine Powers read the Architectural Review Board memorandum, in part, as follows: Consideration of a conceptual review of the design and materials associated with a 6-level parking structure with a three—story commercial and office component fronting Maryland Avenue. The proposed project will be located on property which currently contains the City’s parking lot at 103 North Central, parking dedicated to the 25 North Central building at 111 North Central, and parking for the adjacent St. Joseph’s Church at 119 North Central. The proposed mixed use structure will measure approximately 47.5-feet in height from average existing grade to the top of the limestone façade. The parking garage portion of the building will be less in height, which staff estimated will be approximately 30-feet from finished grade to the top of the rain-screen. Three levels of parking above grade are proposed with the remaining three levels placed below-grade. The garage will accommodate parking for 420 vehicles. The square footage of the garage area is 166,433. Fronting Maryland Avenue will be a combination of 18,420 square feet of retail and 9,177 square feet of office space occupying three stories totaling 27,597 square feet. The exterior will contain three primary materials: limestone panels, composite rain screen panels, and pre-finished metal screen

panels for the garage openings. The limestone panels are proposed for the “front” of the building consisting of the commercial and office areas. Storefront windows with large mesh fabric awnings are shown above the storefront entrances. A significant portion of the garage aspect of the building will be faced with a laminate rain screen product manufactured by Trespa. The specific color and texture of the rain screen has not been provided but material samples indicate a terra cotta color. The openings of the garage will contain a pre-finished metal screen panel. The plans show finished concrete columns in between the metal screen panels. The vehicle stop system is shown on a section drawing also faced with the rain screen panels, which will partially screen the parked vehicles from view. It is not known if these rain screen panels will be the same as the rest of the project. The north elevation will contain a brick veneer retaining wall used for a raised planter area to serve as a buffer from the residential area to the north. The rain screen panels will be seen beyond the planting area. On the west elevation, a brick veneer retaining wall is proposed to screen the garage ventilation wells. The front of the elevation, which will be the most visible from Maryland, will contain primarily rain screen panels with some windows. The applicant is proposing the installation of City Streetscape along North Central and Maryland Avenues. In addition, a recessed patio area to be utilized for outdoor dining is proposed along Maryland Avenue. Signage facing Maryland is shown in front of the awning mounted on a horizontal sign bar. This design is very similar to the existing signs on The Crescent mixed-use building. Signage is shown on the plans on the east and south elevations at the top of the third floor depicting an additional tenant. These signs have not been reviewed for compliance with the Sign Ordinance and should be considered as conceptual at this time. A sign package should be submitted for formal review and approval by the ARB at a later date. Catherine stated that the building portion of the structure facing Maryland represents an attractive design incorporating limestone panels and a patio area for use by the retail tenants; however, staff has concerns with the extensive use of the rain screen panels utilized on the other portions of the structure. In addition, staff has concerns with the use of the metal screen panels for the garage openings. As presented, staff does not feel the extensive use of these materials is appropriate given the location adjacent to a residential area. Staff is concerned not only about the incompatible material but also about lighting issues from cars inside the garage and the visibility of the cars on the roof of the parking deck from the north. If the exterior of the garage is lit, lighting trespass from inside the garage would not be as much of a consideration but undue attention would be called to the structure if this were done. Staff would prefer a more traditional brick or stone design with smaller areas of the composite rain screen material which would more appropriately be used as accents and would be more compatible with the adjacent residential neighborhood and recommends that the members provide input and recommendations for the design and materials of Phase I portion of the project consisting of the garage and commercial element on the northwest corner of Maryland and North Central.

Catherine noted that the Trespa (rain screen product) only carries a 10 year warranty.

Chairman Sanger reiterated that this is conceptual only and therefore, there will be no vote tonight.

Mr. Stephens indicated that with regard to the hotel design, it is not yet fully flushed out, although the garage design is completed and the traffic study is done. He stated that the traffic study indicates that the class level of the intersection does not change with this development. He indicated that with regard to security, the Code requires the exit stair in the garage and that the walkway/access to the condominium building has been eliminated from the plans. He stated they

would be happy to incorporate exterior lighting if that is what the residents of the condo building to the north want. He stated with regard to the height of the structure, the only difference between this proposal and the previous plan is the addition of one more parking level and that the shadow does not cross over the fence line of the condo building to the north.

Steve Lichtenfeld commented again that the building seems higher to him.

Marc Lopata asked why they are proposing the Trespa.

Mr. Stephens stated that the front limestone panels are being proposed to help echo the condo building and that the Trespa is a rain screen product. A sample of the Trespa was presented to the members. He stated that the product is completely submersible and that the panels come in 3 X 6 with an open joint in between. Samples of the brick and limestone were presented. He stated that the use of red and tan are appropriate colors for the area.

A slide depicting the garage next door and the Graybar garage was presented.

A sample of the stainless steel screen product was presented. Mr. Stephens advised the members that the Bellagio garage has the same pattern as is being proposed (a slide depicting the Bellagio garage was shown).

Steve Lichtenfeld asked about control of the headlights.

Mr. Stephens indicated there is none.

Marc Lopata asked which material has the 10 year warranty.

Catherine Powers replied "the Trespa".

Marc Lopata asked if its content includes recycled material.

Mr. Stephens replied "yes".

Marc Lopata indicated the need to be cautious of erosion. He stated he would hate to see streaks running down the building.

Steve Lichtenfeld voiced his concern with the use of the proposed materials on the north side of Maryland as they seem over-scaled and have an industrial feel. He stated he does, however, have less of a concern with the use of these materials on the south side of Maryland. He stated the importance of bridging the gap between the large scale CBD and the small scale residential area.

Mr. Stephens indicated that he did not recommend the use of brick or stone.

Steve Lichtenfeld stated he has no real problem with the use of Trespa, but he does have concerns with the 10 year warranty. He stated he would want assurance that the product would not deteriorate in 30 years, much less in 10.

Mr. Stephens commented that the produce has been used for years extensively in Europe. He stated that they may consider a product other than brick, but it is unlikely. He stated he does not believe brick is appropriate for a high rise building.

Jim Liberman stated the garage building seems overwhelming.

Chairman Sanger reminded everyone that this building adjoins a residential area and the need for the transition to respect this residential area. He stated that he is aware that the garage needs big openings.

Steve Lichtenfeld mentioned the Library/Garage at Euclid and Lindell, which fits well into the lower scale residential area.

Ms. Sharon Burke, member of St. Joseph's Church, stated she, too, has a concern with the height of the garage structure as it looks like the east end of the church will be in a shadow.

Mr. Stephens agreed that the church windows are important and that he personally observed the windows at 10:00 a.m. and much of the shadow is from the Graybar building. He went on to explain that even the windows in the shadow are still "lit up". Mr. Stephens then presented the slides depicting the shadows.

Mr. Meyer stated that he believes they missed the mark on the transition from the CBD to the residential area. He stated he would prefer access off North Central rather than from off Maryland.

Chairman Sanger stated that the concerns that have been raised this evening, to his knowledge, include material selection (specifically the Trespa and steel), height and the transition to the residential neighborhood.

Steve Lichtenfeld suggested lowering the garage by ½ level.

Mr. Stephens stated that the parked cars (in the proposed garage) can be viewed from the second story of the condo building to the north and that it would seem more appropriate to take 1-foot off each level and adding one more level. He stated it seems more appropriate to raise the garage.

Steve Lichtenfeld indicated that if the garage is raised, as suggested, the second level of the condo building will look out onto a wall.

Mr. Kerley stated that they were originally told that the garage would be lower.

Mr. Stephens commented that only the front piece of the garage is higher now. He explained that if each floor was lowered by one foot, the height would actually only be reduced by a total of 2 ½ feet (he provided an explanation).

Being no further questions or comments, Steve Lichtenfeld made a motion to table the Preliminary Development Plan. The motion was seconded by Marc Lopata and received unanimous approval of the members.

Mr. Robert Kramer, RJ York, stated that the comments received this evening will be considered and they will redesign and come back.

Jim Liberman asked staff to check the condo building on Brentwood and Shaw Park Drive, as the brick has been painted a bright orange.

Catherine Powers informed Jim that the paint color is different than what was approved by this Board and that staff is working on this matter.

Being no further business for the Plan Commission/Architectural Review Board, this meeting adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

Recording Secretary